### MOBILEMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC. 2101 Wilson Boulevard Suite 935

Arlington, Virginia 22201 (703) 312-5152

RECEIVED

JUL 3 D 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

July 30, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222 Washington, D.C.

Re:

WT Docket No. 96-18 and PP Docket No. 93-253

Dear Mr. Caton:

Enclosed is a revised version of the MobileMedia Comments and Opposition to Petition for Reconsideration that was filed with the Commission on July 15, 1996.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (703) 312-5152.

Sincerely,

GENE DE ADOINSON
Gene Belardi

Enclosure

RECEIVED

### Before The JUL 3 0 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

AL.	Commi	3	CATIONS	COMMISS	ina
	OFFICE	OF	SECRETA	ARY	iur.

In the Matter of	)	DOCKET EILE DODY ORIGINAL
Revision of Part 22 and Part 90 of the	)	WT Docket No. 96-18
Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future	)	
Development of Paging Systems	)	
	)	
Implementation of Section 309(j)	)	PP Docket No. 93-253
of the Communications Act -	)	
Competitive Bidding	j	

# COMMENTS AND OPPOSITION TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MOBILEMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

MobileMedia Communications, Inc. ("MobileMedia"), the parent company of MobileMedia Paging, Inc. and Mobile Communications Corporation of America ("MobileComm"), 1/2 hereby submits Comments and Opposition to Petitions for Reconsideration regarding the Commission's First Report and Order (the "First Report and Order") 2/2 in the above-captioned docket. First, MobileMedia opposes the suggestion that the Commission grant nationwide exclusivity to applicants who had not yet completed construction of their nationwide networks as of the date on which the Commission adopted its Notice of Proposed Rule Making in the above-captioned docket. Second, MobileMedia supports several parties who favor curtailing the ability of numerous third parties to file mutually-exclusive applications to applications for expansion. Finally, MobileMedia believes

MobileMedia, MobileComm and their subsidiaries comprise the second-largest paging company in the United States, with more than four million units in service. The companies provide service in all 50 states, offering subscribers local, regional and nationwide paging and other wireless messaging services.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> FCC 96-183 (released April 23, 1996).

that the Commission should restrict its exception for processing 929 MHz applications filed prior to February 8, 1996 to those filed by true incumbents.

I. NATIONWIDE EXCLUSIVITY SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED TO APPLICANTS THAT HAVE NOT SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETED CONSTRUCTION OF THEIR INITIAL NETWORKS

The Personal Communications Industry Association ("PCIA") has urged the Commission to grant nationwide exclusivity to licensees who had not yet completed construction of the requisite number of facilities for nationwide exclusivity as of the February 8, 1996 adoption date of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making in this proceeding.<sup>3/</sup> It would be bad public policy to allow applicants who have, in some cases, done nothing but file applications and, in any event, have failed to substantially complete construction requirements for a nationwide license to have their frequencies treated a nationwide exclusive frequencies that are exempt from the modified freeze provisions adopted in the First Report and Order and that will be excluded from geographic licensing. Such applicants were never guaranteed any special status; they were simply given the opportunity to build out their networks to meet requirements for nationwide exclusivity. Unlike others who undertook prompt construction of nationwide networks, these firms elected not to do so. For example, one licensee who was coordinated for nationwide exclusivity in 1994 has yet to build a single base station even though its grant has expiration dates beyond February 8, 1996. It clearly should not be eligible for nationwide exclusivity. These applicants have had ample opportunity to construct; having failed to build out their networks to achieve

See PCIA Petition for Partial Reconsideration, filed June 10, 1996, at 3.

nationwide licenses, they should now compete for licenses in whatever licensing scheme the Commission may adopt in this proceeding. At a minimum, the Commission should analyze each prospective licensee's progress in building out networks and grant exclusivity only to those applicants that have made substantial progress in the construction of nationwide networks.

## II. ONLY BONA FIDE COMPETING APPLICANTS SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO FILE COMPETING EXPANSION APPLICATIONS

MobileMedia supports the numerous parties who seek to curtail the abilities of third parties to file competing applications against *bona fide* expansion applications. <sup>4</sup>/ The ability of incumbent licensees actually to expand their systems is limited by the abilities of numerous other parties to file mutually-exclusive applications against the initial expansion application and thus effectively block the *bona fide* applicant from expanding its system. Under the Commission's proposed rules, any other party, no matter how *bona fide* its interest in developing a paging system, can file a competing application. <sup>5</sup>/ As numerous other parties have argued, "[b]y imposing absolutely no limits on "[mutually-exclusive]" filings, the [First Report and Order] encourages speculative and extortionate filings while

The Commission's recently-introduced change in the cut-off date for eligibility of applicants seeking expansion of their paging systems is the most reasonable solution to resolving which applicants should be able to expand their systems. The amended cut-off to applications on file as of September 30, 1995 is reasonable; applicants who submitted applications after such date could not reasonably have expected grants prior to February 8, 1996 (the previously-selected cut-off based on the actual application grants).

Order on Reconsideration of First Report and Order, WT Docket 96-18, PP Docket No. 93-253 (released June 11, 1996).

offering no rationale as to why these filings are necessary." The Commission simply states that it seeks, "to prevent any possible prejudice to parties with a potential interest in the channel." However, such proposal takes away the very thing which the Commission sought to allow, the ability of incumbent licensees to expand their systems during the freeze, for the Commission will hold all mutually-exclusive applications, including of course the initial expansion application, in abeyance until the conclusion of this proceeding. While the purpose of the expansion filing rights is to allow existing licensees to meet customer needs, the granting to any party the ability to file against such application appears to have no justification. The Commission has the authority to set licensee eligibility standards and has indeed used such authority to limit the class of potential initial applicants for expansion. The Commission should likewise restrict the class of potential competing filers to incumbent co-channel licensees.

Petition for Partial Reconsideration of ProNet, Inc., filed June 10, 1996, at 5; see also Petition for Clarification and/or Partial Reconsideration of Interim Licensing Rules, filed June 6, 1996, at 3-5; Petition for Partial Reconsideration of Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson & Dickens, filed June 6, 1996, at 5; Petition for Reconsideration of Paging Network, Inc., filed June 10, 1996, at 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See First Report and Order, ¶ 26.

See Petition for Clarification And/or Partial Reconsideration of Interim Licensing Rules of Ameritech, filed June 6, 1996 (citing U.S. v. Storer Broadcasting, 351 U.S. 192 (1956).

# III. THE COMMISSION'S PROCESSING OF 929 MHZ APPLICATIONS SHOULD APPLY ONLY TO BUILT-OUT INCUMBENTS

The Commission states that only 929 MHz PCP exclusive applications filed by incumbents on or before February 8, 1996 and which are not mutually exclusive, will be processed. Diamond Page argues that the Commission should include applicants like themselves, who have never built out their systems and indeed do not currently operate any PCP systems, within the definition of "incumbent." This is merely an attempt to gain an unjustified exemption from whatever licensing and auction scheme the Commission adopts for the paging industry. The Commission's interim licensing policy is intended to allow incumbent operators to add service to meet customer requirements. Obviously, parties such as Diamond Page, which have no PCP operations or customers, are beyond the scope of that policy. At bottom, Diamond Page and others similarly situated are not incumbents and there is no policy reason to treat them as such.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should further modify its partial freeze by curtailing the ability of third parties to file competing applications against *bona fide* 

See First Report and Order, ¶ 42.

See Petition for Clarification or Reconsideration of Diamond Page Partnership, AmericaOne Partnership, and affiliated entities (collectively, "Diamond Page"), filed June 10, 1996, at 3.

expansion applications and by clarifying its definition of "incumbent" for purposes of defining which 929 MHz PCP applications should be processed during the pendency of the freeze.

Respectfully submitted,

Gene P. Belardi

Vice President

MobileMedia Communications, Inc. 2101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 935

GENE P. BECARDI/MEN

Arlington, Virginia 22201

(703) 312-5152

Dated: July 15, 1996

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Andrea Rainey, hereby certify that on this 30th day of July, 1996, copies of COMMENTS AND OPPOSITION TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MOBILEMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC. were hand-carried or mailed to the following individuals:

Chairman Reed E. Hundt Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 814 Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Jackie Chorney
Legal Assistant to Chairman Reed Hundt
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 838G
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner James H. Quello Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 802 Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. Rudolfo M. Baca Legal Advisor to Commissioner Quello Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 802 Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Andrew C. Barrett Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 826 Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Lisa Smith
Senior Legal Advisor to Commissioner Barrett
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 826
Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Susan Ness Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 802 Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. David Siddall Legal Advisor to Commissioner Ness Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 802 Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Rachelle B. Chong Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 844 Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Susan Toller Legal Advisor to Commissioner Chong Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 844 Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Michelle Farquhar
Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
2025 M Street, N.W., Suite 5002
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. Gerald P. Vaughan
Deputy Chief
Federal Communications Commission
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
2025 M Street, N.W., Suite 5002
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Rosalind K. Allen Associate Bureau Chief Wireless Telecommunications Bureau 2025 M Street, N.W., Suite 5002 Washington, D.C. 20554 Mr. David Furth
Chief of Commercial Wireless Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
2025 M Street, N.W., Suite 5002
Washington, D.C. 20554

Timothy E. Welch Hill & Welch Suite #113 1330 New Hampshire Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Henry A. Solomon Melodie A. Virtue Haley Bader & Potts Amelia L. Brown Suite 900 4350 North Fairfax Drive Arlington, VA 222303-1633

Caressa D. Bennet Michael R. Bennet Bennet & Bennet 1831 Ontario Place, NW Suite 200 Washington, D.C. 20009

George Y. Wheeler Koteen & Naftalin 1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Thomas Gutierrez, Esq.
J. Justin McClure, Esq.
David L. Nace
George L. Lyon, Jr.
Pamela L. Gist
Pamela Gaary
Elizabeth R. Sachs
Terry J. Romine
Lukas, McGowan, Nace & Gutierrez
1111 19th Street, N.W. 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Harold Mordkofsky
John A. Prendergast
Richard D. Rubino
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson
& Dickens
2120 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Dennis L. Myers Ameritech Mobile Services, Inc. 2000 West Ameritech Center Drive Location 3H78 Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195-5000

Laura H. Phillips Christina H. Burrow Dow, Lohnes & Albertson 1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

Larry Shaefer SMR Systems, Inc. 4212 Mt. Vernon Houston, TX 77006

Ellen S. Mandell Pepper & Corazzine 200 Montgomery Building 1776 K Street, N.W. Suite 200 Washington, DC 20006

Phillip L. Spector
Thomas A. Boasberg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind,
Wharton & Garrison
1615 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

David L. Hill
Audrey P. Rasmussen
O'Connor & Hannan
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006

Katherine M. Holden Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Lucille M. Mates 140 New Montgomery Street, Rm. 1526 San Francisco, CA 94105

Margaret E. Garber 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004

Kenneth E. Hardman Moir & Hardman 200 L Street, N.W., Suite 512 Washington, DC 20036

Lisa M. Zaina OPASTCO 21 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036

Joe D. Edge Tina M. Pidgeon Drinker Biddle & Reath 901 Fifteenth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005

Robert H. Schwaninger, Jr. Brown & Schwaninger 1835 K Street, N.W., Suite 650 Washington, D.C. 20006 Veronica M. Ahern Nixon, Hargrave, Devans & Doyle One Thomas Circle Washington, DC 20005

David Jatlow, Esq. Young & Jatlow 2300 N Street, N.W., Suite 600 Washington, DC 20037

Carl W. Northrop Esq.
Christine M. Crowe, Esq.
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
1299 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Tenth Floor
Washington, DC 20004

Mark J. Golden
Personal Communications
Industry Association
500 Montgomery Street, Suite 700
Alexandria, VA 22314

Judith St. Ledger-Roty Stefan M. Lopatkiewicz Paul G. Madison Reed Smith Shaw McClay 1301 K Street, N.W. Suite 1100-East Tower Washington, DC 20005

Jill Albeshouse Stern Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20037

Daniel E. Smith
Jerome K. Blask
Gurman, Blask & Freedman
1400 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

Dallas Vanderhoof TeleBEEPER of New Mexico, Inc. P.O. Box 25161 Albuquerque, NM 87125

Lawrence M. Miller Schwartz, Woods & Miller 1350 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 300 Washington, DC 20036

Robert R. Rule Rule Radiophone Service, Inc. 2232 Dell Range Boulevard Cheyeene, Wyoming 82009

Frederick M. Joyce Christine McLaughlin Joyce & Jacobs 1019 19th Street, N.W. 14th Floor, PH-2 Washington, DC 20036

William Ciuffo
John Roussos
John Sieber
Comp Comm, Inc.
One Echelon Plaza, Suite 100
227 Laurel Road
Voorhees, NJ 08043

Lloyd D. Huffman Huffman Communications 2829 W. 7th Ave Boz 1753 Corsicana, TX 7151

William J. Franklin 1200 G Street, N.W., Suite 800 Washington, DC 20005 Richard S. Becker
James S. Finerfrock
Jeffrey E. Rummel
Richard S. Becker & Associates
1915 Eye Street, N.W, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20006

John L. Crump ACE Communications 11403 Waples Mill Road Post Office Box 3070 Oakton, VA 22124

Mary McDermott Linda Kent Charles D. Cosson U.S. Telephone Association 1401 H Street, N.W. Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20005

A. Thomas Carroccio Bell, Boyd & Lloyd 1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 1200 Washington, D.C. 20036

William L. Fishman, Esq. Sullivan & Worcester LLP 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1000 Washington, D.C. 20036

Andrea Rainey